

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/676,544	CHRYSANTHAKOPOULOS ET AL.
	Examiner Christopher A. Daley	Art Unit 2111

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher A. Daley. (3) Michael Camarata (39491).
 (2) Paul Meyers. (4) Naphtali Matis.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: see attached amendment to claim 1.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Reardon (US6212638).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed amendment appears to over come submitted prior art. Similar amendemens will be also made to all independent claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

PAUL R. MEYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner's signature, if required

CONTINUATION SHEET

And Reardon is merely another encryption key based authorization method which is not port based and does not automatically deem a management port as authorized to receive management commands. Applicant may be willing to amend the claims further to better express this concept as shown, for example, below.

Claim 1 (currently amended): A method for remotely managing a computer coupled to a communication bus, the method comprising:

predetermining one port of the computer as a management port and deeming the management port as the only port automatically authorized for receiving one or more management commands and all other ports as not automatically authorized for receiving any management command;

receiving, via the communication bus, the management command;

determining whether the management command was received at the management port coupled to the communication bus or received at a second port; and

when-if the management command was-is received at the management port, executing the management command without requiring further authentication or authorization and if the management command is received at the second port ignoring the management command.